

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

15 June 2017

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Bonwitt, J. and Kandeh, M. and Dawson, M. and Ansumana, R. and Sahr, F. and Kelly, A. H. and Brown, H. (2017) 'Participation of women and children in hunting activities in Sierra Leone and implications for control of zoonotic infections.', PLoS neglected tropical diseases., 11 (7). e0005699.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005699>

Publisher's copyright statement:

© 2017 Bonwitt et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Participation of women and children in hunting activities in Sierra Leone and implications for control of zoonotic infections

Jesse Bonwitt^{1¶*}, Martin Kandeh^{2&}, Michael Dawson^{3&}, Rashid Ansumana^{3&}, Foday Sahr^{4&}, Ann H. Kelly^{5&} and Hannah Brown^{1¶}

¹Department of Anthropology, University of Durham, Durham, UK

²Department of Social Sciences, Njala University, Bo, Sierra Leone

³Mercy Hospital Research Laboratory, Bo, Sierra Leone

⁴Department of Microbiology, College of Medicine and Allied Health Sciences, University of Sierra Leone, Freetown, Sierra Leone

⁵Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, King's College London, London, UK

***Corresponding author**

Jesse.Bonwitt@durham.ac.uk

Abstract

The emergence of infectious diseases of zoonotic origin highlights the need to understand social practices at the animal-human interface. This study provides a qualitative account of interactions between humans and wild animals in predominantly Mende villages of southern Sierra Leone. We conducted fieldwork over 4 months including participant and direct observations, semi-structured interviews ($n=47$), spontaneously occurring focus group discussions ($n=12$), school essays and informal interviews to describe behaviours that may serve as pathways for zoonotic infection. In this region, hunting is the primary form of contact with wild animals. We describe how these interactions are shaped by socio-cultural contexts, including opportunities to access economic resources and by social obligations and constraints. Our research suggests that the potential for exposure to zoonotic pathogens is more widely distributed across different age, gender and social groups than previously appreciated. We highlight the role of children in hunting, an age group that has previously not been discussed in the context of hunting. The breadth of the "at risk" population forces reconsideration of how we conceptualize, trace and monitor pathogen exposure.

Author summary

Studying how and why humans interact with animals is important to understand the transmission of zoonotic diseases (infectious diseases transmitted from animals to humans) and how to control them. We conducted a qualitative study to understand how and why people come into contact with wild animals in the Southern province of Sierra Leone, a region with numerous wildlife species known to carry zoonotic diseases. Previous studies on hunting in sub-Saharan Africa principally describe adult men as hunters and adult women as retailers of meat from wild animals. Based on our results, we seek to broaden the category of people deemed “at risk” of zoonotic diseases through hunting by including women and children. In particular, because of their limited physical abilities and social position, children hunt under different circumstances than those of adults. Our results have implications for zoonotic disease research and prevention, for example by ensuring children are integrated in health interventions and that their unique reasons to hunt are taken into account during such processes.

1 Introduction

Recent occurrences of infectious disease outbreaks involving pathogens such as Lassa virus, Ebola virus and simian retroviruses have led to increasing concern about emerging zoonoses [1]. The probability of a zoonotic infection depends in part upon the frequency and nature of contact between animal hosts and humans [2]. Thus, in addition to the biological aspects of pathogen transmission, zoonotic diseases must be understood as resulting from social processes. Social science approaches are therefore an essential component in the study of infectious diseases [3]. More specifically, the environmental, social, cultural and economic aspects of animal-human interactions must be studied alongside human and animal behaviours to determine pathways for infections [2].

As a socially dense, gendered and sometimes secretive activity, hunting is a prime topic for in-depth social scientific analysis. Hunting and butchering wild animals poses a significant risk for transmission because such activities expose humans to animal secretion and fluids through bites, scratches and handling organs [4]. Outbreaks of Ebola Virus Disease (EVD), for instance, have been directly attributed to handling various wild mammal species during hunting or as carrion [5]. Hunting has been a major topic in disciplines such as anthropology, including in West and Central Africa [6-8]. However, the public health dimensions of these animal-human interactions are only beginning to be subject of sustained ethnographic consideration [9-12].

The multifaceted nature of animal-human interactions can pose considerable methodological challenges for research, particularly when such practices are hidden or secretive. Hunting, for instance, can be forbidden by law or custom; it can be associated with disease; and it can involve practices or knowledge that amplify social

26 status or satisfy social requirements. The 2014–2016 EVD outbreak heightened these
27 ambiguities following a ban on hunting, sale and consumption of meat from wild
28 animals. Using questionnaire surveys to investigate sensitive topics may introduce
29 systemic bias [13-15]. In particular, children are more difficult to study through
30 quantitative survey techniques and their role as a potential group at risk from zoonotic
31 infection remains largely unrecognized. Such difficulties can be alleviated by
32 immersive qualitative and open-ended study that necessitates trusting relationships,
33 developed over lengthy periods of time. Long-term qualitative studies allow
34 researchers to build a rapport with informants that can reveal information not
35 accessible through other methods. Open-ended approaches, with a strong
36 observational component, facilitate understanding of behaviours at the animal-human
37 interface that are routinized and/or controversial [16].

38 Anthropological studies of animal-human interactions such as hunting and
39 butchering practices can offer a critical entry point to understanding zoonotic risk
40 dynamics [17, 18]. Ethnographic approaches help to frame public health
41 understanding of the ways different social groups engage with animals and can inform
42 the design of disease surveillance measures. Understanding the drivers of animal-
43 human interactions is important when designing risk mitigation strategies. Further, a
44 fuller appreciation of such interactions can help to contextualize research in zoonotic
45 disease ecology. This is of particular use in West Africa following the renewed
46 interest in zoonotic disease ecology in the region with the presence of numerous wild
47 animal reservoirs for zoonotic pathogens, including Lassa virus [19] and ebolavirus,
48 which has possibly been circulating in West Africa for decades [20-22].

The aim of this study was to provide a finely grained description of human actors and behaviours that may serve as pathways for zoonotic infection from wild animals, and to understand the drivers behind these behaviours.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study site

The fieldwork was conducted in the Southern (Bo, Pujehun and Moyamba districts) and Eastern (Kenema district) Province of Sierra Leone (**Fig. 1**). We conducted fieldwork in urban and rural locations. Bo City is the second largest city of Sierra Leone and its inhabitants are involved in a range of economic activities including small-scale trading and salaried employment. Bo City borders swamps and grasslands merging into a mosaic of swidden farmland and secondary forests. In rural locations, three villages were chosen based on previous fieldwork and familiarity with the field researchers. These villages (between 6 and 12km from the outskirts of Bo City) were visited at a minimum twice weekly during the fieldwork and provided the core of the data collected. Six other villages, identified through snowball sampling, were chosen to represent more isolated areas (up to 40-50km from a major town) but were only visited between 1 and 4 times. Villagers depend on fishing, hunting, swidden farming, cultivation of small plots and small-scale trade for subsistence and income.

Fig 1: Map of Sierra Leone.

Fieldwork was conducted in the Southern and Eastern Province, up to 50km from Bo City and Kenema, the two largest cities of these provinces (created with <http://umap.openstreetmap.fr>).

Fieldwork was conducted for a total of 4 months in 2015 (August, September, November, and December), overlapping the rainy (May–October) and dry seasons (October–May). We also draw on interviews and observations collected in May and

June 2014 from the same study site. Some of the fieldwork took place during the EVD outbreak, although we worked in districts without active cases during fieldwork. Given the sensitive nature of our research during the EVD epidemic, we began by visiting informants known to us through previous fieldwork. Transects through villages, forests and swidden served to identify people engaging in behaviours of interest.

2.2 Interview and discussions

We conducted semi-structured interviews and informal discussions until data saturation was achieved. The discussions were conducted in English, Mende or Krio (creole English). Interviews lasted between 30 and 60 minutes. The questions were pre-determined and covered food security, local gastronomy and forms of interactions with wild animals, which included their practical and symbolic significance. A separate question set covered the impact of the EVD epidemic and is discussed elsewhere. Photos of wild animal species were used to determine vernacular names and ensure accuracy of translation. Although the interview guides were pre-defined, questions were posed in an informal manner to encourage discussion.

2.3 Observations guides

The observation guides used for direct and participatory observations covered forms of direct and indirect contact between humans and wild animals. Participatory observations were mainly done with trusted informants. Informants were given the opportunity to ask questions about the link between wild animals and EVD. Our answers covered risk factors for zoonotic infection and current hunting regulations. Thereafter, no attempt was made to challenge the activities observed, except to encourage basic biosecurity measures when handling animal carcasses.

2.4 Written essays

We set two simple written essay questions for children aged 14 to 16 years attending the school of village A. The questions asked children to describe an animal that lives in the bush and to describe the last hunt in which they participated.

2.5 Data processing and analytical strategy

Recordings and field notes were immediately transcribed into English by the field researchers (JB and MK) using MS Word 2011. The data was rendered anonymous from the onset and shared online with the research team. Analysis was carried out continuously and interview and observation guides were amended iteratively. Triangulation was obtained with three field researchers (JB, MK and MD) and multiple methods of data collection. Coding was done in MS Word 2011 using a thematic analysis. *A priori* codes included forms of interactions with wild animals, use of wild animals and food security. Inductive codes were applied to understand the social, cultural and economic context of these interactions.

2.6 Ethics

The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Government of Sierra Leone and the University of Exeter. Participants were provided with information sheets that were read out. We emphasized that participants did not have to answer questions and could end their participation at any time without consequences. Written and oral consent was obtained from the respondent or a parent for participants under 18 years.

3 Results

We conducted 47 semi-structured interviews and 12 spontaneously occurring focus group discussions, collected 13 essays and performed 14 days of participatory observations. Direct observations and informal discussions were conducted throughout. Informants included village chiefs, elders, teachers, housewives, farmers,

small-scale traders and children (from the age of 5). Three hunters from one village refused to be interviewed. Among the respondents of the semi-structured interviews, one informant was interviewed twice. Interviews with 18 respondents were not recorded because they refused, or indicated that they preferred not to be recorded. Respondents were predominantly Mende ($n=41$, 89%) or mixed Mende ($n=7$, 15%) and either Muslim ($n=18$, 39%), Christian ($n=22$, 48%) or unknown ($n=6$, 13%). There were 32 (70%) men and 14 (30%) women. Information about children was mostly collected during participatory and direct observations and informal interviews.

3.1 Classification of animals

The Mende classify animals into three broad categories: livestock, pets (dogs and cats) and wild animals (“bush animals”). The term “bush animals” refers to species that live in or outside of villages but are not domesticated. Villagers discuss these primarily as a crop pest (e.g. rodents) or as resource to be exploited. “Bush animals” have individual vernacular names in Mende. In the following text, we group species according to their size, ranging from small (small rodents, squirrel, mongoose, bat, bird, amphibians, reptiles), medium (Gambian pouched rat, cane rat, brush tailed porcupine, genet cat, small non-human primates), and large species (forest antelope and forest hog).

3.2 Trapping and hunting

We set out with about 7 adult hunters and a dozen children (aged around 6-12), most of whom carried nets on their head. Everyone brought their own cutlass (I brought one to fit in,) and dogs obediently followed their owners’ steps. You could tell that both dogs and people were excited by the hunt, and as we made our way through the bush, everyone became progressively quieter.

(...)

150 *The first hunt was unsuccessful and we moved to a second area (about a kilometer*
151 *from the previous one), again unsuccessful. To get there, we passed along a long*
152 *fence with many traps set along it. The third hunt was successful; a grass cutter (cane*
153 *rat) got tangled in the net and was jumped upon by the hunters. They kept it alive until*
154 *I got there and then killed it by punching his head in (you cannot used a cutlass as it*
155 *destroys the net). Relatively fast to unconsciousness, no more than 7 seconds. Blood*
156 *everywhere. The kill was immediately handed to a boy (who was very proud of it) and*
157 *ran away in the bush with it on his shoulders. The hunt continued again and we*
158 *moved twice more until the hunt was declared over (field notes from a communal hunt*
159 *DO-04A)*

160

161 **Fig 2. Communal hunting with nets.**

162 A cane rat (*Thryonomys swinderianus*) caught during a communal hunt. The animal
163 was bludgeoned to death by hitting the skull with bare fists, rather than a machete, to
164 avoid damaging the hunting net.

165

166 **Techniques.** Communal hunting with nets is done with a group of people
167 including net owners who encircle a delimited area with their nets, and dog owners,
168 who use their dogs to flush prey towards the nets. Other participants close off the rest
169 of the delimited portion and flush out animals. During the communal hunt that we
170 participated in, animals were bludgeoned to death with fists to avoid damaging
171 expensive nets (**Fig. 2**). Ideally, hunting excursions last until sufficient quantities of
172 game are caught so as to share meat with every member of the party. For example, we
173 participated in two hunts where a large cane rat was caught, in both cases, hunting
174 activities continued for more than half of the day in the hope to secure additional
175 game. Communal hunting parties are formed to protect crops by flushing animals but
176 are rarely done because of the amount of coordination they involve. We only observed

four episodes of communal hunting in two of our main study villages. According to elder informants, communal hunting was more common before the civil war (1991-2002) when meat was given to visiting dignitaries such as politicians, census officials, and tax collectors. However, the same informants affirmed that the custom of gifting meat to dignitaries was no longer practiced. They explained this by a shift in perception brought on by campaigns from non-governmental organizations following the civil war. These campaigns advocated for “democratic” values by reducing the servitude of village subjects towards the village chief and, by extension, to visiting officials. Whilst communal hunting was a feature of the village calendar, most hunting was carried out independently. In our study area, trapping (use of snares) is the most common method for catching animals. Different traps are adapted to target certain species, although some are relatively indiscriminate in the species they catch. Traps are easy to learn and build, but their upkeep can be time consuming because of the need for regular checking and repair. This, and access to snare cables, is the principal limitation to the number of traps that an individual will lay and there is considerable variation amongst individuals. We counted between five to hundred traps per owner, the latter which can take up to half a day to check.

Hunting with guns is frequent, but done in secret because firearm ownership has been prohibited since the end of the civil war. There is tacit knowledge in villages of who owns a hunting firearm. These are locally made barrel guns that use standard shotgun cartridges. Hunting is usually done at night with torches to startle and freeze prey, which are usually medium and large sized species. Army and police officers can legally shoot animals that cause severe agricultural damages (such as buffalos), but they are reported to use their privileges to hunt other species in collaboration with villagers who serve as guides in exchange for a share of meat.

202 Hunting dogs are trained to point, chase and kill small and medium sized
203 animals. Other methods of hunting involves smoking prey out from burrows, use of
204 slings and catapults (for small rodents, birds and bats), encircling patches of bush and
205 cutting it down (“brushing”) or setting fire to it (for most species). Whenever an
206 animal is spotted and the chances are deemed high enough to catch it, any method is
207 used including bare hands, machetes and sticks. Running after prey until exhaustion
208 was described twice, for a forest antelope and a cane rat and incidents of drowning
209 exhausted animals were also recorded.

210 Bats are hunted with specialized methods. Cave dwelling bats (*pan devi*) are
211 whipped with long sticks as they fly out from the mouth of caves. In our study area,
212 access to and around certain caves is strictly regulated because they are used for male
213 secret society (*poro*) ceremonies, thus non-initiates and women are forbidden to
214 approach them. Prior to the ban on firearms, shotgun cartridges filled with grit were
215 used to kill tree roosting fruit bats (*taje*) colonies. Since then, other methods are
216 employed such as slings, catapults (a variant of a sling with multiple shots) and one
217 village reportedly used a net strung between trees. The bad smell of insectivorous bats
218 (“thatch bats”, *jassahun devi*) precludes them from consumption, but children will
219 catch them from the thatch of houses and use them as playthings. Overall, bats are
220 considered “*too strenuous to go after*” (informal discussion, town elder) and so are
221 mostly hunted opportunistically, for example if they are roosting in small trees.
222 However, one village that we visited was located near caves housing large bat
223 colonies and villagers from surrounding villages assembled annually to hunt bats in
224 late November. In these instances, villagers reported filling up bags containing up to
225 50 bats.

226 **Skill acquisition and success rates.** Hunting and trapping skills are acquired through
227 observation and participation with experienced hunters and trappers, usually members
228 of the family. If the household head is not a hunter or trapper, it is unlikely that other
229 family members under his direct care will be either. In this case, hunting/trapping can
230 be learned from friends, extended family, or through people employed to set traps on
231 farmland. Children learn from adults and from each other. The success rates of
232 trapping and other forms of hunting are inconsistent. One farmer described how
233 animals “*can enter into the nets and still escape, so it is a game of luck*” (farmer, IDI-
234 04A). One trapper responsible for about 60 traps caught animals only every few
235 weeks, communal hunting rarely resulted in more than a few animals caught in a day.
236 Communal hunting was considered more efficient than trapping, until rarefication of
237 game made it less so.

238 **Participation in hunting.** Hunting with guns is the exclusive domain of males, and
239 historically that of *kamajors*, loosely defined as “traditional hunters” [23]. *Kamajors*
240 are distinguished by their membership to hunting brotherhoods, which, historically,
241 requires months long initiation. They are respected for their hunting skills, their
242 fearlessness in killing large, dangerous animals such as forest hogs, buffalos and
243 leopards (now locally extinct), their knowledge of medicinal plants and their historical
244 role in protecting villages from wild animals and enemies. This status is slowly being
245 eroded and replaced by hunters that use guns but have not gone through the initiation
246 necessary to enter hunting brotherhoods. Despite this, such hunters are respected for
247 their knowledge of the forest and their ability to navigate it at night, because doing so
248 places them in contact with the world of witchcraft and sorcerers. Because witches
249 and sorcerers are considered to have the ability to navigate between human and
250 animal forms, large game hunters will cut the tail off large nocturnal animals as proof

of having killed an animal rather than a human. Whether they hunt with guns or not, men, including traditional hunters, participate in all types of hunting.

Women participate in communal hunting, helping to flush prey into nets. They are also opportunistic hunters when working in the fields or other activities. Many women recounted an episode where they caught various species of animals, typically during fishing. Two accounts by women described drowning a deer and large snake during fishing. Women will recount such episodes with pride at proving themselves to men, and happiness at having contributed meat to the household. Women do not generally hunt with traps mainly because of the danger posed by the powerful spring mechanisms used (**Fig. 3A and 3B**). However some women do routinely engage in trapping (and in other male activities such as palm oil harvesting) typically because they do not have a strong family support structure, such as widows without children. In general, discussing women who hunted or trapped did not generate any negative comments when discussed with men. However, women who surpassed men in these activities were forbidden to do so, as they were considered to breach traditional gender roles.

Fig 3. Snare traps.

A common trap (dahin), which can catch most species of mammals and reptiles (A) and a trap specifically designed to snare small non-human primates (B) as they cross a cleared portion of forest on a branch. These latter traps are uncommon because they are difficult to build and non-human primates learn to avoid them. Both traps work by snaring animals with use of a spring mechanisms when they pass through a sensitive trigger mechanism (arrows).

Hunting amongst children parallels that in adults, with boys more likely to hunt than girls. Boys hunt alone or in groups, starting from about 7 years of age. All forms of hunting and trapping are practiced (with the exception of gun hunting). However, owing to their limited physical ability, children use smaller trap

280 constructions and target smaller species (**Fig. 4A**): “*Sometimes we dig. We used to*
281 *search for their [squirrel] holes. Yes, where they entered. Even where we mark one*
282 *hole we search, one person will stop there and trace it where it stops [exits]. Another*
283 *person stands there and will begin to dig (laugh); we come close to meat*” (young
284 man, IDI-08A). One teacher described the opportunistic hunting conducted by
285 children: “*I just see three children with 2 kpomie [tree hyrax]. I said how did you*
286 *catch these things? He said they are just on their way going to their farms and they*
287 *saw them on the road, they were about to cross the road. So they kill them on the*
288 *road. Because the kpomie is not able to run like sewei [cane rat]” (IDI-09A)*”. One
289 child with a reputation for being a good hunter (but poor student) boasted of owning
290 at least fifteen traps. When baby animals are caught, they are reared to adulthood as
291 pets and then used for food, usually under the responsibility of children (**Fig. 4B**). We
292 frequently observed children playing with wild animals even beyond the point of
293 death, with particular fascination for inspecting and opening mouths, and stroking fur.
294 In Bo City and villages, boys hunt cats and other animals in groups and attach value
295 in cooking them amongst each other, which is known as “boys cooking”.

296

297 **Fig 4. Children hunting.**

298 Children hunting with dogs owned by the family and borrowed from an unknowing
299 neighbour (A). The dogs detect or chase rodents into burrows, which are then dug up
300 by the children. A genet kitten (*Genetta* sp.) (B) and Gambian pouched rat
301 (*Cricetomys gambianus*) (C) kept as pets. In both cases, the kittens and pups were
302 reared by children in a chicken coop and eventually eaten.

303

304 **Catch distribution.** The kill is divided between the participants according to
305 traditional custom with specific body parts distributed to net and dog owners and the
306 person that caught the animal. The help provided by women is appreciated and they
307 are entitled to equal portions.

308 The circumstance of the kill and the size of the animal determine how an
309 animal is shared between members of the family and who will butcher it. If an adult
310 household member judges that his or her catch is too small to suffice for the
311 household, he or she may decide to keep it for him or herself only: *“if it small, as I*
312 *cannot share with my wife, I eat it alone”* (farmer, IDI1-17). This scenario is
313 particularly common when farmers catch a small animal while farming and have
314 access to cooking utensils in their farmhouse. Larger game is bought home and
315 usually sold or cooked by women.

316 There exists a tacit requirement to share a part of the meat, if sufficiently
317 large, with the wider family or close friends if they reside nearby. Refusal to share
318 creates a negative reputation of “greediness”, which sometimes pushes villagers to
319 hide and sell meat outside of their own village so that they are not pressured into
320 making too many gifts. Sharing is also expected in certain circumstances, for example
321 a wild animal caught on someone else’s land or with someone else’s dog.

322 **Temporal characteristics of hunting and trapping.** Hunting and trapping occur all
323 year round but predominantly during rice farming (planting to harvest: April–
324 December) and the rainy season (May–October), when swidden rice nears maturity
325 and is particularly vulnerable to crop pests. During this period, fences with traps are
326 built around fields. In their school essays, children reported hunting daily or weekly,
327 which was corroborated with field observations. The essays were set just before the
328 rice harvest when grain stocks from the previous year are at their lowest (the “hungry
329 season”) and the requirement for other sources of food (e.g. animal protein) is high.

330 **Spatial characteristics of hunting and trapping.** We observed hunting, trapping and
331 fishing in rural, urban and peri-urban areas of Bo City, where the urban landscape
332 merges into agricultural land (swidden), swamps and tertiary forests.

3.3 Food Preparation and Consumption

“You know monkey does not have too much flesh, when the pepper, the maggi [spices], goes into the bone you will suck and enjoy it” (student, IDI-09B).

The only preparation methods for meat that we observed involved singeing the hair, followed by gutting and butchering (**Fig. 5**). When selling meat to traders, hunters usually sell the entire carcass because of the higher price it will receive. In this instance, the market seller butchers the carcass. Only certain parts of animals are not eaten (nails, hooves, and horns). The gut and the gall bladder are the only viscera that are consistently removed, as they are deemed to taste bad and be poisonous. Some people choose to remove the genital organs because of the smell. Any unwanted organs are thrown away, fed to dogs, or kept for use as bait in fish and crustacean traps. Bones are eaten entirely unless too big, in which case they are broken and the marrow is sucked out, which is particularly prized by some.

Fig 5. Butchered meat following a communal hunt.

A cane rat (*Thryonomys swinderianus*) caught during a communal hunt. The carcass is singed, butchered and shared between the participants who either cook it together or bring it back to their household.

Preparation is not gender specific. Cooking is done over a fire. It involves grilling meat over the fire, frying it in palm oil, boiling it in water, or more often, a combination of all. Leftover meat can be conserved by smoking it over a fire. Palm oil brought to boiling point is widely believed to kill pathogens and other impurities in food, such as rodent poison, which is occasionally used to protect swidden. While the majority of people prefer eating well-cooked meat and gag at the suggestion of eating raw meat, two people stated that they prepared a soup from boiled meat that retains

360 raw blood, as it is considered more “*nourishing*” in terms of protein, as well as better
361 tasting: “[We] let the blood just escape a little and then (laughs) we start eating it [the
362 meat]. Sometimes we do not cook it, we do not cook, we only put it on the fire, make it look
363 fine then we eat it. And then you will really eat and enjoy it” (urban farmer, IDI-05B).

364 During our observations, carcasses were always handled with bare hands and
365 blood was rinsed off with water or sometimes with chlorine water, which is present in
366 villages since the EVD outbreak.

367 3.4 Reasons for Hunting

368 “We hunt [deer] because we need money and meat and use the skin to make
369 drum” (middle school student, essay on hunting).

370

371 **Food.** A major reason for killing wild animals is for an immediate source of protein.
372 This needs to be understood in the context of available alternatives: cows are rare in
373 the Southern Province, their meat it expensive and only available at market points.
374 Goats and sheep are more common but are not routinely eaten as they serve for rapid
375 cash income (e.g. funerals and weddings). Chicken and ducks are used for rapid cash
376 income, gifts, or for occasional personal consumption. The most common and
377 cheapest source of protein is commercial fish (smoked fish and frozen fish, which is
378 delivered to even the most remote villages) and forest products (invertebrates and
379 freshwater fish), which are inexpensive or free, but seasonal.

380 The importance of eating meat is related to cultural notions of what constitutes
381 a flavoursome and healthy diet. Rice is the staple food and should always be
382 accompanied with a meat “sauce” (*ndahain*). The negative formulation of “empty
383 rice” refers to rice that does not contain sauce, or contains a sauce without meat
384 (definitions vary, but the absence of meat is the defining feature). “Empty rice” is

385 never a voluntary choice and there is a daily pressure to provide some form of meat
 386 within a household. Frozen fish does not fulfil this demand as it is considered to lack
 387 “*taste and vitamin*” (farmer, informal interview 05A). In contrast, red meat is
 388 discussed in terms of health benefits, with vocabulary borrowed from nutrition
 389 awareness campaigns that recommend giving meat to malnourished and anaemic
 390 children. Red meats provide “*sound health*” (farmer, IDI-25A), “*energy*” (farmer,
 391 IDI-03A), gives “*blood faster*” (farmer, IDI-30A), “*makes body and mind strong*”
 392 (farmer, II-05A), and is “*more nutritious than ice [frozen] fish*” (farmer, IDI-03A).
 393 Further, fish does not provide the same sense of satisfaction and satiety that red meat
 394 does in an otherwise bland and repetitive culinary environment. Hence even though
 395 small mammal species provide little meat, they give a much-appreciated taste to the
 396 *ndahain*. Small species are also relatively abundant and easy to catch: “*we go to the*
 397 *swamp and brush [a form of hunting] so easily we can get meat. And that is the*
 398 *simple way we can get the meat faster*” (teacher, IDI1-21). So important is the need
 399 for protein that our principal informants reported that it is difficult to pass the
 400 opportunity to scavenge an animal found sick or dead: “*the dead animal I found (...).*
 401 *It was freshly dead, like a snake bite that [bit the] sewei [cane rat] because normally if*
 402 *it is being shot by a gun we can smell the cartridge scent on the animal but this was*
 403 *not the case. I wanted to believe that it was a snake that bite that sewei and we found*
 404 *it on our rice farms, so because it was fresh we had to eat it*” (IDI-09A, village
 405 teacher, pastor and farmer). Even during the EVD outbreak, one housewife stated:
 406 “*even now, when I see one [an animal], I will make use of it, even a dead one*” (IDI-
 407 21A).
 408 Although the driving force behind communal hunting is crop protection,
 409 people will avoid wasting meat whenever it is made available, as occurs if an animal

410 is caught, which is regarded as a blessing. Revelatory of the importance of not
411 wasting animal protein is the “*pepper law*” — a punishment given to anyone who,
412 through carelessness, lets game escape during communal hunting. Eating (chilli)
413 peppers and other punishments, such as the obligation to clear the village of
414 undergrowth, pay a fine or not receive a share of meat, point to the importance of not
415 letting game escape. Providing an insight into the sensations felt during hunting, one
416 farmer described the pepper law as “*painful [...] so next time when I went to take the*
417 *hunting net I was ready for the animal, because for the first time when I had never*
418 *caught an animal, when I saw the animal coming, my entire body was trembling, so it*
419 *made me leave it to go, so I chew that pepper. So next time when we went I challenged*
420 *it [the animal], I said I was going there again that time I did not chew pepper again*
421 *when the animal came, that day I caught two fritambos [duiker antelopes]*” (IDI-
422 05B).

423 **Crop protection.** Protecting crops from pest animals is a key preoccupation of
424 farmers. It involves erecting wooden fences with traps around swidden and building
425 watchtowers to kill or ward off animals. Undertaking communal hunts to flush
426 animals away is considered an important, and sometimes obligatory, practical duty.
427 Farmers appreciate when hunters operate in vicinity of their farmland in the hope that
428 it will flush pests away and spare their crops: “*I have made effort to drive away those*
429 *animals so that they will not destroy them [crops] again. So that is why people do tell*
430 *me thanks. It is for that reason that I am very popular in this area, I do help so many*
431 *people*” (urban farmer, IDI-11B).

432 **Income.** Animal protein is a product in high demand that can be easily sold and
433 guarantees rapid cash flow. The decision of whether to keep wild meat for personal
434 consumption or for sale varies between individuals and situations. The decision

435 making process involves implicit cost-benefit calculations taking into account the
436 potential revenue of the animal, the amount of money saved by not buying fish, and
437 appetite. In general, small species with little market value (bats, squirrels, other small
438 rodents) are kept for personal consumption or, if sold, usually only within the village.
439 Bats are considered too small to provide much meat but are sufficient for the *ndahain*.
440 For this reason they are mostly given to friends and family members, including those
441 that have emigrated to urban areas. They can be sold within villages at a low price
442 (US\$ 0.1-0.5). Medium sized species can be divided for personal consumption and sale
443 in villages or towns. Large game is sold either in town where urban residents will pay
444 a higher price for it, or in villages if the seller is assured that there are enough clients.
445 Gun hunters most frequently engage in commercial trading, as they are more likely to
446 kill large game and need to recover their investment in cartridges. They have
447 established networks of middlemen and retailers and can invest more time in hunting
448 and trapping. For small market chains (intra and inter-village trade and trade with Bo
449 City), meat is most commonly sold fresh, either as entire carcasses or in butchered
450 pieces.

451 **Other uses of animal products.** We documented the use of animal species for
452 medical purposes. This includes toads (for whooping cough), raw monkey skin or
453 burnt squirrel hair (wrapped around burn wounds), snakeskin and intestine of the
454 brush-tailed rat (to ease stomach pain), and duiker horns made into necklaces (for
455 babies with convulsions or other ailments). In urban areas, monkey pepper soup is a
456 popular dish classically eaten between friends on a night out because it is thought to
457 lessen the effects of hangovers. Hides from forest antelopes are still occasionally used
458 to make drums and farming gloves and snakeskins can be made into belts.

459 **Social importance of wild meat.** In rural areas, a boy who has never caught an
460 animal is considered “idle” (lazy). The ability to bring back a wild animal is part of a
461 set of skills that is required of an adult farmer. As one boy explained, “*I don't bring it*
462 *[rat] to town because, if my parents see it they will frown at me that the only animal I*
463 *can catch is a rat, that is why I eat it in the bush*” (FGD-16B). Boys and young men
464 will bring meat back as an attempt to seduce girls, who will cook the meat in privacy
465 and share with her suitor. This can be reciprocated when the girlfriend’s family
466 obtains game; the girl will keep some and share it covertly with her boyfriend.
467 Meat plays an important role in ceremonies. It is, for instance, a traditional
468 requirement at funerals. When families cannot afford domestic meat for funerals,
469 villagers or friends will hunt with them to spare them the embarrassment of being
470 unable to provide meat. Rarely, communal hunting is organized to provide meat for
471 religious occasions. Hunting and trapping skills are a main feature in initiation rites of
472 male secret societies for entering adulthood, but details are not discussed with non-
473 initiates.

474 **Taboos and religious interdicts.** Many Mende believe that the characteristics of
475 what an animal feeds on are transferred onto the person who eats that animal. Animals
476 caught in proximity to graveyards, waste sites and latrines are usually discarded,
477 although we did note occasional exceptions, especially with children. These are more
478 likely to hunt and consume peri-domestic animals such as small rodents that are
479 usually shunned by adults.

480 The only species consistently avoided, irrespective of religion, gender or age,
481 are the musk shrew (widely believed to transmit Lassa fever), monitor lizards (its
482 prominent forked tongue relates back to the concepts of twins and associated taboos),
483 cobras (associated with untrustworthiness) and dogs (because of their practical

484 importance in hunting and defence, and the emotional attachment many people have
485 with them). Other taboos varied between individuals, including chimpanzees, tree
486 hyraxes and namesake animals.

487 Not all Muslims adhered to the prohibitions laid out by the Quran (which
488 identify animals such as swine, non-human primates and rodents as haram —
489 forbidden) as poverty and hunger are considered an adequate justification to eat haram
490 meat, so long as it is not made into a habit. Taboos only apply to consumption as all
491 species can be killed, either because they are crop pests or feared. They are then
492 thrown away, sold or given to people who do not share that taboo. As one farmer who
493 did not eat monkey stated: *“I will not sell it because I have people [who] like monkey,*
494 *I don’t eat it but I have people that eat. So if I catch that one, I will give it to them”*
495 (IDI-29A).

496 **Children.** Children hunt for the same reasons as adults, but their hunting is shaped by
497 different social obligations and physical constraints, which, crucially, determine the
498 type of meat they obtain and the way it is prepared and eaten.

499 Catching wild animals forms part of the domestic responsibilities of children
500 in a household. Parents describe sending their children out to hunt, either routinely or
501 only in certain cases, for example when adults have not been able to secure protein for
502 that day. Although not all parents consider it the responsibility of children to
503 contribute directly to the *ndahain*, some took a strict approach and threatened
504 unwilling children with “empty rice”, to “*encourage*” them to go next time. As one
505 child summarized; *“if I am healthy and do not go hunting, my parents will shout at*
506 *me, and if they buy meat when they cook, they won't dish for me”* (school child, FGD-
507 16B).

508 Further, in Mende households, the hierarchy of the family members is mirrored in the
 509 distribution of food: first the household head, then wife or wives and finally, children
 510 in decreasing age. In the words of one child, it is the “*father [who] will decide what to*
 511 *give and it [the meat] is under his authority even though [the child] caught it*” (IDI-
 512 14A), hence “*here, the children get the bones*” (farmer, IDI-30A). One mother
 513 explained that: “*if my boys [...] come home with meat and I prepare it, let’s say for*
 514 *instance a portion I cut it into 6 portions. I will bring two portions to my husband.*
 515 *Two portion for me. And the other two portion for the two boys. That’s how I will*
 516 *distribute it*” (farmer’s wife, IDI-16A). Thus, children can be disinclined to bring
 517 home any meat they catch, preferring to roast their catch secretly in the forest to avoid
 518 sharing it and being punished by adults. Such considerations form the basis of a social
 519 gathering known as “boy’s cooking”, during which: “*you can eat a lot, the way you*
 520 *want to eat. But maybe at home you just put it out of your small basin [...], it’s not*
 521 *even enough for you. But the boy’s cook; you eat and reserve [keep] another one*
 522 *[portion of meat]. When you eat you will go to the field, play your ball, later when you*
 523 *come back you can continue to eat*” (IDI-20A). Children described how, after
 524 catching an animal in the forest, they pondered the costs and benefits of eating it alone
 525 or bringing it back to the household. Such calculation is based on the size of the catch
 526 and the daily circumstances. Indeed, a careful balance must be sought, as if their
 527 parents find out that their children ate wild meat on their own, they will punish them
 528 with “*empty rice*”, or as one mother succinctly explained: “*if he does not share we*
 529 *also won’t share*” (farmer’s wife, IDI-21A).

530 If children make the decision not to share any meat with their parents, they
 531 will try hard not to be caught. Consequently, children will quickly, and often
 532 incompletely, roast animals so as to speed up the process and avoid detection through

533 smoke and smell. This covert behaviour also holds true with species where the parents
534 have banned consumption (e.g. “town rats”). In urban and peri-urban areas, children
535 will catch rats, lizards and birds and eat them in hiding and parents bemoan the
536 difficulty of controlling them.

537 We observed children catching and selling fish, amphibians and rodents. One
538 entrepreneurial child sold arthropods to a school lab and animals as pets (mongoose,
539 herons, birds of prey, NHPs). The income is then given to the household head and can
540 contribute directly to schooling. As one school child explained: “*I killed a [brush*
541 *tailed] porcupine, last week; I sold mine because I needed lunch to come to school*”
542 (FGD-16B). Such small-scale trade by children is sometimes undertaken in secret for
543 pocket money.

544 **4 Discussion**

545 **4.1 Hunting Behaviours and Risk for Zoonotic Infections**

546 The most common activity placing humans in contact with wild animals observed in
547 our study was hunting and slaughtering, which are associated with zoonotic disease
548 infections and disease emergence [24]. Understanding how differences in
549 demographic, socio-cultural and economic characteristics influence such activities is
550 important to inform pathogen surveillance and prevention measures.

551 Our research suggests that the “conventional” narrative of hunting and its role
552 in pathogen transmission is incomplete. Previous research on hunting in Western and
553 Central Africa commonly describes an activity conducted by adult males, while
554 butchering and trading wild meat is done by women who are exposed to fluids
555 through cuts and scratches [25-27]. This narrative of the “cut hunter” attributes
556 pathogen emergence to “bushmeat hunters” who are invariably assumed to be adult
557 males [11]. In addition, children are rarely thought of as being in contact with wild

animals despite being presumed index cases in at least three EVD outbreaks [28-30]. Further, to our knowledge, questionnaire surveys looking at exposure to wild animals do not recruit subjects below 15 years of age [25-27, 31], yet we frequently recorded hunting among children below this age group. One study on animal-human contacts in Uganda suggests that children from the age of 3 years are exposed to non-human primates, however these results were derived from adults responding on behalf of their children [32].

We previously showed that hunting of small rodents is more widely distributed across age, gender lines and social groups than previously appreciated [14]. In our present study, we sought to determine whether such observations were also pertinent to other species of wild animals, in particular those species that are not present in domestic spaces (as small rodents are) and might be associated with different hunting norms. While our research confirms that among the Mende, hunting is, indeed, considered a traditional adult male activity — the respective roles of hunting and fishing among men and women reflecting divisions of activities that mark gender identity [6, 8] — we find that children and women are significant actors in complex collaborative practices for catching and preparing wild animals. With the exception of large species that are deemed physically dangerous and are associated with witchcraft (buffalo, forest hogs, leopards), the participation of women and children does not conform to assumed gender and age-related roles. Rather, hunting, slaughter, consumption and trade of wild animals are determined by individual circumstances and practicalities. Crucially, contact with wild animals often involves children who, compounded by traditional family hierarchy related to food access, frequently engage in high-risk practices during hunting and preparing meat from wild animals. Thoroughly cooking meat is considered sufficient to inactivate EVD in blood, but

consuming undercooked meat, which was reported by children and adults for different reasons, is likely to present a risk of infection [33] and a similar degree of risk may exist when consuming bone marrow.

4.2 Hunting Species and Distribution

Not all species of wild animals present the same risk of transmitting zoonotic pathogens. For example, certain species of fruit bats are suspected reservoirs for ebolavirus [34] and although we did find some villages organizing bat hunts, we did not find any evidence of systematic bat trade. This could however be specific to ethnic groups or villages and requires further investigation.

Other species of mammals including duiker antelopes and NHPs are susceptible to ebolavirus [35, 36] and hunting sick animals or scavenging carrion is a major risk for ebolavirus infection [5]. We did not identify any particular taboos against eating species that are known to pose a risk for zoonotic diseases, or against collecting fresh carrion, however we did not consistently ask whether people would eat sick wild animals. The process of trapping does not allow trappers to monitor the health of animals before killing them. Further, raw meat is widely distributed across commercial and social networks, with the potential to spread pathogens, with limited possibility for monitoring or traceability. Species, and their associated pathogens, are distributed according to criteria related to market value. Many of the taxa associated with zoonotic pathogens, such as small rodents [37] and bats, have little market value, and are mostly kept for personal consumption and inter-village trade. Children privilege such small sized taxa for their ease of hunting and their low market value, an observation also reported in a nutritional survey of animal species consumed among children in the Democratic Republic of the Congo [38].

We documented occurrences of urban hunting in fringe sites of Bo City, which suggests that such anthropogenic ecotones should be targeted in disease containment strategies. Although such zones have previously been associated with pathogen emergence [39], our findings stand in contrast to common intervention designs which assume, incorrectly, that there is little contact between humans and animals in urban zones, as has recently been described in Uganda [32].

4.3 Incentives for Hunting

Sierra Leone has one of the highest rates of malnutrition and child under-nutrition in the world [40]. In this context of chronic food insecurity, disposing of hunted or trapped game — an important source of nutriment for growth [38, 41] — is rarely an option, especially where access to alternative sources (fish or domestic animals) is scarce or expensive. Family hierarchies prioritise protein consumption among adults, which compounds the difficulty faced by children in obtaining animal protein, encouraging them to hunt. We previously reported how the consumption of rodents is strongly linked to food security [14] and extend this observation to other wild animals that are considered a threat to crops, on which the Mende are highly dependent. The link between crop protection and species hunted has been illustrated in the Eastern Province of Sierra Leone, where cacao farmers were observed to commonly eat monkeys (a cacao pest) hunted on their farms [6].

Adult informants also discussed wild meat in terms of taste, perceived therapeutic and nutritional value, and as a source of income generation, as previously reported in Western and Central Africa [42, 43].

4.4 Changes in Hunting Patterns

Social, political and economic processes can influence host-pathogen dynamics, for example through changes in reservoir abundance and contact with reservoir hosts

[44]. Comparing current practices with accounts from older informants, we described how social changes have modified interactions between humans and wild animals. Communal hunting was discouraged in post-civil war policies because it had been used as a means for village chiefs to impose their authority upon subjects and test for political dissent [8]. This coincided with an increase in fast reproducing, resilient species such as rodents that thrive in a modified agricultural landscape [45]. Previous studies have shown how changes in agricultural practices can influence biodiversity and lead to adaptations in hunting practices, for example “garden hunting” near domestic spaces [46] and trade of wild meat [47]. Such observations support our data that the increasingly small size of animals hunted no longer justify sacrificing time for communal hunting and could explain the reported increase in the use of traps and focus on trapping smaller species, with the potential for changes in zoonotic pathogen ecology. Post-war policies also directly influenced hunting practices by imposing a firearm ban, making bats more difficult to hunt in Sierra Leone compared to Guinea where shotguns are common, and cartridges are loaded with grit to kill large numbers of bats (Bonwitt, J.; pers. obs.).

4.5 Field Challenges and Limitations

Our fieldwork was affected by the EVD epidemic. Sensitization messages erroneously emphasized the risk of infection through contact with wild animals and hunting was penalized. This raised the degree of sensitivity associated with hunting. The quality of discussions often considerably improved when we refrained from recording interviews.

For ethical concerns, the research team answered frequent questions about the risks of ebolavirus infection from wild animals, which arose during discussions and may have affected our results. Our presence initially generated suspicion; however this was

minimized thanks to our work in the area prior to the epidemic. Through observations, discussions and participatory observations, we learned to discern the subtle traces of hunting and trapping activities, such as people with hunting nets or concealed rifles, concealed traps or a cleaned village (a punishment imposed for letting prey escape). Despite these reassurances, we cannot exclude the possibility that we underestimated the frequency of certain behaviours of interest or missed some altogether.

Although we describe behaviours occurring among women and children, the majority of our semi-structured interviews were conducted with males (70%). However, much of our data was obtained, and indeed strengthened from spending time in villages, conducting participatory observations and informal interviews with women and children. Our research could have benefited from more interviews with women, for which a female field researcher would have been beneficial.

Our study could have been enriched by quantitative data. However, we sought to address the paucity of qualitative data on hunting as explored from a public health perspective. In providing a finely grained description on hunting practices we hope that our results will broaden the scope of future quantitative research on this topic.

5 Conclusion

Our observations corroborate previous studies of hunting throughout West and Central Africa [6, 11, 25-27, 31, 32] but emphasize the social nuances of the practice by expanding on the diversity of actors, social norms and motivations involved. The “cut hunter” narrative which assumes most hunters to be adult males has underpinned disease intervention strategies, and remains a subject of debate and research [48]. Previous research has shown the need to expand beyond the “bushmeat paradigm” to include other forms of animal-human contacts as risks for zoonotic infections and that are unrelated to hunting practices [32]. Yet even within the much studied “bushmeat

paradigm”, we find that the diversity of actors hunting wild animals and the breadth of the "at risk" population forces reconsideration in how we conceptualize, trace and monitor pathogen exposure. These results also underscore the challenges of interventions, surveillance, research and sensitization campaigns. To address such complexity, intervention strategies should become more nuanced and diversified. In particular the role of children should be recognised; specific intervention strategies should be tailored to children’s specific hunting practices.

Finally, our findings provide a base for further investigations to determine risk factors for zoonotic infections in the West African region. A better understanding of the interactions between humans and reservoir hosts can help to elucidate the mechanisms of disease spillover into human populations in Sierra Leone [49] by linking epidemiological, ecological and ethnographic data.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to our informants for welcoming us home and sharing their knowledge of the bush with generosity and humour. We thank the staff of Mercy Hospital Research Hospital for their invaluable support, Matthias Borchert for his comments on the study design, and Julien Gavelle and Almudena Marí Sáez for their reflections during the fieldwork.

References

1. Daszak P. Anatomy of a pandemic. *The Lancet*. 2012;380:1883-4.
2. Wolfe N, Ngole Eitel P, Gockowski J, Muchaal PK, Nolte C, Prosser AT, et al. Deforestation, hunting and the ecology of microbial emergence. *Global Health & Human Health*. 2000;1(1).
3. Janes CR, Corbett KK, Jones JH, Trostle J. Emerging infectious diseases: the role of social sciences. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9857):1884-6. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61725-5. PubMed PMID: 23200487.
4. Wolfe ND, Daszak P, Kilpatrick M, Burke DS. Bushmeat Hunting, Deforestation, and Prediction of Zoonotic Disease Emergence. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2005;11(12):1822-7.
5. Groseth A, Feldmann H, Strong JE. The ecology of Ebola virus. *Trends Microbiol*. 2007;15(9):408-16. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2007.08.001. PubMed PMID: 17698361.
6. Leach M. Rainforest Relations: Gender and Ressource Use Among The Mende of Gola, Sierra Leone. The University Press, Cambridge, Great Britain: Edinburgh University Press; 1994.
7. Lewis J. Forest hunter-gatherers and their world: a study of the Mbendjele Yaka Pygmies of Congo-Brazzaville and their secular and religious activities and representations.: University of London; 2002.
8. Ferme MC. The underneath of things: violence, history, and the everyday in Sierra Leone. London, England: University of California Press Ltd.; 2001.
9. Cormier L. Kinship with Monkeys. The Guajá Foragers of Eastern Amazonia: Columbia University Press; 2003.

- 725 10. Epelboin A, Bahuchet S, Durand JL. Le bon goût de la viande de primate: des
726 interdits des Pygmées Aka aux injonctions écologiques. In: Cross M, Bondaz J,
727 Michaud M, editors. L'animal cannibalisé Festins d'Afrique. Paris: Editions des
728 archives contemporaines; 2012.
- 729 11. Giles-Vernick T, Gondola CD, Lachenal G, Schneider WH. Social History,
730 Biology, and the Emergence of Hiv in Colonial Africa. *The Journal of African*
731 *History*. 2013;54(01):11-30. doi: 10.1017/s0021853713000029.
- 732 12. Lawson ET, S. Ayivor J, Ohemeng F, Ntiamoa-Baidu Y. Social Determinants
733 of a Potential Spillover of Bat-Borne Viruses to Humans in Ghana. *International*
734 *Journal of Biology*. 2016;8(2):66. doi: 10.5539/ijb.v8n2p66.
- 735 13. Razafimanahaka JH, Jenkins RKB, Andriafidison D, Randrianandrianina F,
736 Rakotomboavonjy V, Keane A, et al. Novel approach for quantifying illegal bushmeat
737 consumption reveals high consumption of protected species in Madagascar. *Oryx*.
738 2012;46(04):584-92. doi: 10.1017/s0030605312000579.
- 739 14. Bonwitt J, Kelly AH, Ansumana R, Agbla S, Sahr F, Saez AM, et al. Rat-
740 atouille: A Mixed Method Study to Characterize Rodent Hunting and Consumption in
741 the Context of Lassa Fever. *Ecohealth*. 2016;13(2):234-47. doi: 10.1007/s10393-016-
742 1098-8. PubMed PMID: 26895631; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4996873.
- 743 15. St. John FAV, Edwards-Jones G, Gibbons JM, Jones JPG. Testing novel
744 methods for assessing rule breaking in conservation. *Biological Conservation*.
745 2010;143(4):1025-30. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2010.01.018.
- 746 16. Woldehanna S, Zimicki S. An expanded One Health model: integrating social
747 science and One Health to inform study of the human-animal interface. *Social science*
748 *& medicine*. 2015;129:87-95. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.10.059. PubMed PMID:
749 25464873.

750 17. Wood JL, Leach M, Waldman L, Macgregor H, Fooks AR, Jones KE, et al. A
751 framework for the study of zoonotic disease emergence and its drivers: spillover of
752 bat pathogens as a case study. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of*
753 *London Series B, Biological sciences*. 2012;367(1604):2881-92. doi:
754 10.1098/rstb.2012.0228. PubMed PMID: 22966143; PubMed Central PMCID:
755 PMC3427567.

756 18. Fuentes A. Human culture and monkey behavior: Assessing the contexts of
757 potential pathogen transmission between macaques and humans. *Am J Primatol*.
758 2006;68(9):880-96. doi: 10.1002/ajp.20295. PubMed PMID: 16900502.

759 19. Fichet-Calvet E, Rogers DJ. Risk maps of Lassa fever in West Africa. *PLoS*
760 *neglected tropical diseases*. 2009;3(3):e388. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000388.
761 PubMed PMID: 19255625; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2644764.

762 20. Le Guenno B, Formenty P, Boesch C. Ebola virus outbreaks in the Ivory Coast
763 and Liberia, 1994-1995. *Curr Top Microbiol Immunol*. 1999;235:77-84. PubMed
764 PMID: 9893379.

765 21. Knoblovh J, Albiez EJ, Schmitz H. A serological survey on viral
766 haemorrhagic fevers in Liberia. *Ann Virol (Inst Pasteur)*. 1982;133(E):125-8.

767 22. Schoepp RJ, Rossi CA, Khan SH, Goba A, Fair JN. Undiagnosed acute viral
768 febrile illnesses, Sierra Leone. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2014;20(7):1176-82.
769 doi: 10.3201/eid2007.131265. PubMed PMID: 24959946; PubMed Central PMCID:
770 PMC4073864.

771 23. Ferme MC, Hoffman D. Hunter Militias and the International Human Rights
772 Discourse in Sierra Leone and Beyond. *Africa Today*. 2004;50(4):73-95. doi:
773 10.1353/at.2004.0043.

774 24. Pike BL, Saylor KE, Fair JN, Lebreton M, Tamoufe U, Djoko CF, et al. The
775 origin and prevention of pandemics. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2010;50(12):1636-40. doi:
776 10.1086/652860. PubMed PMID: 20450416; PubMed Central PMCID:
777 PMCPMC2874076.

778 25. Subramanian M. Zoonotic disease risk and the bushmeat trade: assessing
779 awareness among hunters and traders in Sierra Leone. *Ecohealth*. 2012;9(4):471-82.
780 doi: 10.1007/s10393-012-0807-1. PubMed PMID: 23408099.

781 26. Wolfe ND, Prosser TA, Carr JK, Tamoufe U, Mpoudi-Ngole E, Torimiro JN,
782 et al. Exposure to nonhuman primates in rural Cameroon. *Emerging infectious*
783 *diseases*. 2004;10(12):2094-9. doi: 10.3201/eid1012.040062. PubMed PMID:
784 15663844; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3323379.

785 27. LeBreton M, Prosser AT, Tamoufe U, Saterren W, Mpoudi-Ngole E, Dikko
786 JLD, et al. Patterns of bushmeat hunting and perceptions of disease risk among central
787 African communities. *Animal Conservation*. 2006;9(4):357-63. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-
788 1795.2006.00030.x.

789 28. Shoemaker T, MacNeil A, Balinandi S, Campbell S, Wamala JF, McMullan
790 LK, et al. Reemerging Sudan Ebola virus disease in Uganda, 2011. *Emerging*
791 *infectious diseases*. 2012;18(9):1480-3. doi: 10.3201/eid1809.111536. PubMed
792 PMID: 22931687; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3437705.

793 29. Mari Saez A, Weiss S, Nowak K, Lapeyre V, Zimmermann F, Dux A, et al.
794 Investigating the zoonotic origin of the West African Ebola epidemic. *EMBO Mol*
795 *Med*. 2014;7(1):17-23. doi: 10.15252/emmm.201404792. PubMed PMID: 25550396;
796 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4309665.

797 30. Heymann DL, Weisfeld JS, Webb PA, Johnson KM, Cairns T, Berquist H.
798 Ebola Hemorrhagic Fever: Tاندالا, Zaire, 1977–1978. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*.
799 1980;142(3):372-6. doi: 10.1093/infdis/142.3.372.

800 31. Friant S, Paige SB, Goldberg TL. Drivers of bushmeat hunting and
801 perceptions of zoonoses in Nigerian hunting communities. *PLoS neglected tropical*
802 *diseases*. 2015;9(5):e0003792. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003792. PubMed PMID:
803 26001078; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4441483.

804 32. Paige SB, Frost SD, Gibson MA, Jones JH, Shankar A, Switzer WM, et al.
805 Beyond bushmeat: animal contact, injury, and zoonotic disease risk in Western
806 Uganda. *Ecohealth*. 2014;11(4):534-43. doi: 10.1007/s10393-014-0942-y. PubMed
807 PMID: 24845574; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4240769.

808 33. EFSA. An update on the risk of transmission of Ebola virus (EBOV) via the
809 food chain. *EFSA Journal*. 2014;12(11):3884. doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3884.

810 34. Leroy EM, Kumulungi B, Pourrut X, Rouquet P, Hassanin A, Yaba P, et al.
811 Fruit bats as a reservoir of Ebola virus. *Nature*. 2005;438(7068):576. doi:
812 10.1038/438576a. PubMed PMID: 16319874.

813 35. Rouquet P, Froment JM, Bermejo M, Kilbourn A, Karesh W, Reed P, et al.
814 Wild animal mortality monitoring and human Ebola outbreaks, Gabon and Republic
815 of Congo, 2001-2003. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2005;11(2):283-90. doi:
816 10.3201/eid1102.040533. PubMed PMID: 15752448; PubMed Central PMCID:
817 PMC4320460.

818 36. Olivero J, Fa JE, Real R, Farfán MÁ, Márquez AL, Vargas JM, et al.
819 Mammalian biogeography and the Ebola virus in Africa. *Mammal Review*. 2016. doi:
820 10.1111/mam.12074.

- 821 37. Han BA, Schmidt JP, Bowden SE, Drake JM. Rodent reservoirs of future
822 zoonotic diseases. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
823 *States of America*. 2015;112(22):7039-44. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1501598112. PubMed
824 PMID: 26038558; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4460448.
- 825 38. van Vliet N, Nebesse C, Nasi R. Bushmeat consumption among rural and
826 urban children from Province Orientale, Democratic Republic of Congo. *Oryx*.
827 2014;49(01):165-74. doi: 10.1017/s0030605313000549.
- 828 39. Despommier D, Ellis BR, Wilcox BA. The Role of Ecotones in Emerging
829 Infectious Diseases. *EcoHealth*. 2006;3(4):281-9. doi: 10.1007/s10393-006-0063-3.
- 830 40. International Food Policy Research Institute. *Global Nutrition Report 2016:*
831 *From Promise to Impact: Ending Malnutrition by 2030*. Washington, D.C.: 2016.
- 832 41. Golden CD, Fernald LC, Brashares JS, Rasolofoniaina BJ, Kremen C.
833 Benefits of wildlife consumption to child nutrition in a biodiversity hotspot.
834 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*.
835 2011;108(49):19653-6. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1112586108. PubMed PMID: 22106297;
836 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3241784.
- 837 42. van Vliet N, Mbazza P. Recognizing the Multiple Reasons for Bushmeat
838 Consumption in Urban Areas: A Necessary Step Toward the Sustainable Use of
839 Wildlife for Food in Central Africa. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. 2011;16(1):45-
840 54. doi: 10.1080/10871209.2010.523924.
- 841 43. Nasi R, Brown D, Wilkie D, Bennett E, Tutin C, van Tol G, et al.
842 *Conservation and Use of Wildlife-Based Resources: The Bushmeat Crisis* Montreal,
843 Quebec, Canada, and Bogor, Indonesia: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
844 Diversity and Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR); 2008.

- 845 44. Wilcox BA, Colwell RR. Emerging and Reemerging Infectious Diseases:
846 Biocomplexity as an Interdisciplinary Paradigm. *EcoHealth*. 2005;2(4):244-57. doi:
847 10.1007/s10393-005-8961-3.
- 848 45. Brncic T, Amarasekaran B, McKenna A, Mundry R, Kühl HS. Large mammal
849 diversity and their conservation in the human-dominated land-use mosaic of Sierra
850 Leone. *Biodiversity and Conservation*. 2015;24(10):2417-38. doi: 10.1007/s10531-
851 015-0931-7.
- 852 46. Linares OF. "Garden Hunting" in the American Tropics. *Human Ecology*.
853 1976;4(4).
- 854 47. Cowlishaw GUY, Mendelson S, Rowcliffe JM. Evidence for post-depletion
855 sustainability in a mature bushmeat market. *Journal of Applied Ecology*.
856 2005;42(3):460-8. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2664.2005.01046.x.
- 857 48. Rupp S, Ambata P, Narat V, Giles-Vernick T. Beyond the Cut Hunter: A
858 Historical Epidemiology of HIV Beginnings in Central Africa. *Ecohealth*.
859 2016;13(4):661-71. doi: 10.1007/s10393-016-1189-6. PubMed PMID: 27718030.
- 860 49. Spengler JR, Ervin ED, Towner JS, Rollin PE, Nichol ST. Perspectives on
861 West Africa Ebola Virus Disease Outbreak, 2013-2016. *Emerging infectious diseases*.
862 2016;22(6):956-63. doi: 10.3201/eid2206.160021. PubMed PMID: 27070842;
863 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4880067.

864